

1249 Hi Point St.  
Los Angeles, Calif. 90035  
October 30, 1968

Mr. George Rennar  
1316 13th Avenue, N.W.  
Seattle, Wash. 98107

Dear George,

Many thanks for sending the copies of yours and Menaker's correspondence with Alvarez. Again, he does not choose to deal with the crucial question, ~~xxxxxx~~ the possibility (to my mind, the certainty) of additional shots fired very close to those he specifies -- which he has admitted to me would be undetectable with his method. Since the two additional hits I posit (the 237-238 Connally shot, and the second JFK ~~had~~ head-shot at app. 314) both are in this category, his repeated failure to confront the implications renders meaningless his conclusion that "...three shots and only three were fired..." (his letter to Menaker, 8/15/68) pg 3

In his letter to me of 5/10/68, Alvarez said:

"This is what I say in the Kennedy film--a series of three well-defined trains of oscillations, each lasting approximately one second. I attributed these three trains -- not the individual pulses within a train -- to a shot. I am quite convinced that one cannot use this method to look at shots that come closer than 1 second, since then the trains would overlap, and could not be resolved."

In my letter to him of 5/16/68 I said:

"I believe that CBS should have indicated to the public that your analysis did not preclude more than three shots having been fired if any two were fired within a second of each other. I feel sure I am correct in assuming that you informed them of this, am I not?"

In his distinctly testy reply of 5/23/68 he dealt with irrelevancies and did not answer my question. In my next letter to him (5/31/68) I repeated the question as follows:

"In my last letter, on the assumption that you had informed CBS of this one-second limitation, I pointed out that they should have indicated this fact to the public. You did not respond to my request for clarification as to whether or not my assumption was correct, and I again ask for such clarification."

He started his next (again, testy) letter of 6/8/68 with the following:

"Referring to your latest letter on the Zapruder films, you are certainly right that the conclusion that there were only three shots does depend on the fact that if there had been more shots, some of them must have occurred within one-half second of another one. I fail to see why CBS should have informed the public of this half-second time resolution, because they did not go into any detail at all as to the nature of the trains of oscillations, but merely pointed out the three times when the three shots that showed up were fired. I would take your concern about the notification of the public of the one-second limitation seriously if, when you publish your work, you put in a proviso that you cannot eliminate the possibility that 13 more shots were fired in a frame you designate as coinciding with a shot. You will certainly have to agree your method has a resolution

time of approximately 2 frames, or 1/9 second, as contrasted with the half-second resolution of my method. That small difference between our two resolutions hardly seems significant to me."

In my last letter to him, 6/15/68 (copy enclosed), I decided to play straight-man to his reductio ad absurdum, and tried once more to get a meaningful answer to the question. Although he has not replied, I now believe that CBS was not specifically informed of the limitation -- although I am certain it wouldn't have influenced their show job even had he done so.

It isn't clear to me whether his one-second resolution of 5/10/68, which seems to have become a one-half second resolution by 6/8/68, has now been reduced to a one-third second resolution (his letter to Menaker, 9/20/68, pg2).

Also, I note he repeatedly uses the same testiness in his letters to Menaker as he did in mine. I don't know if this is his normal personality, or whether it's reserved for those questioning his findings on the assassination. Dr. Alvarez protests too much.

Sincerely,



encl: ~~EM~~ letter to ~~LA~~, June 15, '68